

systems of scheduled water releases from Dam Number 3;

9. Will scheduled water releases into the Ocoee River channel between Dam Number 3 and Dam Number 2 impact the re-establishment of aquatic life in this section of river and if so will this affect operation of TVA's Toccoa/Ocoee River power generation operations; and

10. How will transportation facilities in the general area be affected.

In preparing the environmental impact statement, a range of alternatives will be considered to meet the purpose and need for the proposed action including at a minimum, the proposed action and the no action alternatives. Additional alternatives may be developed to address significant issues received during the scoping process. The EIS will disclose the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of implementing each of the alternatives.

Development of recreation opportunities may impact the floodplain of the Ocoee River. Consonant with Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management Guidelines, the environmental impact statement will analyze and disclose impacts to floodplains and the potential effects of facility construction within the Ocoee River floodplain.

Public participation will be especially important at several points during the analysis process. The first point in the analysis is the scoping process (40 CFR 1501.7). The scoping process includes, but is not limited to:

- (1) Identifying potential issues,
- (2) Identifying issues to be analyzed in depth,
- (3) Eliminating insignificant issues or those which have been covered by a relevant previous environmental analysis,
- (4) Exploring additional alternatives, and
- (5) Identifying potential environmental effects (i.e., direct, indirect, and cumulative) of the alternatives.

The Forest Service is seeking information, comments, and assistance from Federal, State and local agencies, and other individuals or organizations who may be interested in or affected by the proposal. This information will be used in the preparation of the draft environmental impact statement. Notification letters will be sent to all known interested and/or affected parties and the media to solicit public participation.

Public briefings will be held to provide information and to gather issues and concerns on the proposed action. When the dates and locations of workshops have been determined, this

information will be made known through local media, direct contact with known interested publics, and direct mailings.

The draft environmental impact statement is expected to be filed with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and to be available for public review by March 1996. At that time, EPA will publish a notice of availability of the draft environmental impact statement in the Federal Register.

The comment period on the draft environmental impact statement will be 45 days from the date the Environmental Protection Agency publishes the notice of availability in the Federal Register.

The Forest Service believes, at this early stage, it is important to give reviewers notice of several court rulings related to public participation in the environmental review process. Upon release of the draft environmental impact statement, projected for March 1996, reviewers must structure their participation in the environmental review of the proposal so that it is meaningful and alerts an agency to the reviewers position and contentions.

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. NRDC, 435 U.S. 519, 553 (1978). Also, environmental objections that could be raised at the draft environmental impact statement stage but that are not raised until after completion of the final environmental impact statement may be waived or dismissed by the courts. *City of Angoon v. Hodel*, 803 F.2d 1016, 1022 (9th Cir. 1986) and *Wisconsin Heritages, Inc. v. Harris*, Supp. 1334 (E.D. Wis. 1980) Because of these court rulings, it is very important that those interested in this proposal participate by the close of the 45-day comment period so that substantive comments and objections are made available to the Forest Service at a time when it can meaningfully consider them and respond to them in the final environmental impact statement.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and concerns on the proposed action, comments on the draft environmental impact statement should be as specific as possible. It is also helpful if comments refer to specific pages or chapters of the draft statement. Comments may also address the adequacy of the draft environmental impact statement or the merits of the alternatives formulated and discussed in the statement. (Reviewers may wish to refer to the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act at 40 CFR 1503.3 in addressing these points.)

After the comment period ends on the draft environmental impact statement, the comments will be analyzed, considered, and responded to by Agencies in preparing the final environmental impact statement. The final environmental impact statement is scheduled to be completed by June 1996.

The responsible official will consider the comments, responses, and environmental consequences disclosed in the final environmental impact statement, and applicable laws, regulations, and policies in making a decision regarding this proposal. The responsible official will document the decision made and reasons for the decision in a Record of Decision.

The responsible official is John F. Ramey, Forest Supervisor, Cherokee National Forest, P.O. Box 2010, Cleveland, TN 37320.

Dated: September 8, 1995.

John F. Ramey,

Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 95-23704 Filed 9-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration

Pilot Programs Allowing More Than One Official Agency to Provide Official Services Within a Single Geographic Area

AGENCY: Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration (GIPSA).

ACTION: Notice

SUMMARY: GIPSA announces two pilot programs allowing more than one official agency to provide official services within a single geographic area.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 1, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Neil E. Porter, Director, Compliance Division, GIPSA, USDA, Room 1647 South Building, P.O. Box 96454, Washington, DC 20090-6454.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Neil E. Porter, telephone 202-720-8262.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Sections 7(f) and 7A of the United States Grain Standards Act, as amended (Act), were amended by the U.S. Grain Standards Act Amendments of 1993 (Public Law 103-156) on November 24, 1993, to authorize GIPSA's Administrator to conduct pilot programs allowing more than one official agency to provide official services within a single geographic area without undermining the declared policy of the Act. The purpose of pilot programs is to evaluate the impact of allowing more than one official agency to provide

official services within a single geographic area.

GIPSA requested comments on five possible pilot programs in the March 14, 1994, Federal Register (59 FR 11759): timely service; barges on selected rivers or portions of rivers; exceptions; commercial inspections; and submitted samples. Comments were due by April 22, 1994. GIPSA received 41 comments on these possible pilot programs: seventeen comments from official agencies or employees of official agencies opposed these pilot programs; twenty-two comments from grain firms, grain trade associations, and a few official agencies supported these pilot programs; and two comments from official agencies were neutral.

The comments submitted by official agencies expressed their concern over being pressured to grade more leniently or risk losing customers, the possible issuance of multiple original grades on a single lot of grain, losing major customers to competing official agencies, being forced to give preferential treatment to large customers over small customers, and maintaining a relatively uniform inspection volume sufficient to preserve their personnel base.

Comments from the grain trade noted difficulty in getting services when needed to avoid additional charges and the possibility of better service and/or lower cost if they could choose the official agency to provide such services. They also indicated a desire for pilot programs encompassing all services, a more specific proposal to comment on, and a concern that the structure of a pilot program could determine its success or failure.

After considering these comments and other information, GIPSA, in the March 10, 1995, Federal Register (60 FR 13113), developed and asked for comments on two proposed pilot programs: "Timely Service" (one of the original five pilot programs) and "Open Season" (an additional pilot program). The remaining four pilot programs proposed in March 14, 1994, Federal Register (barges on selected rivers or portions of rivers, exceptions, commercial inspections, and submitted samples) were determined to be too narrow in scope to conduct an appropriate pilot program.

Comments on these two proposed pilot programs were due by May 5, 1995. GIPSA received 15 comments. Seven official agencies and one official agency organization opposed these pilot programs citing their belief that the pilot programs would have an adverse impact on the integrity of the official inspection system. Three of these agencies also

expressed concern about grain handling facilities being able to participate in the open season pilot program as a result of seasonal shipping patterns or doing without official services for 6 months. GIPSA recognizes these concerns, but believes that there are adequate safeguards in the proposed pilot programs. Two official agencies, one grain handling facility, and four grain trade organizations supported these pilot programs citing their belief that the pilot programs would promote more timely official inspection services. Two of the trade organizations recommended that timely service be redefined to mean when the final grades are received by the customer. GIPSA agrees and has modified the Timely Service pilot program to differentiate between obtaining sampling/weighing services and receiving inspection results.

The following two pilot programs will start on November 1, 1995, and end on October 31, 1996.

1. **Timely Service.** This pilot program allows official agencies to provide official services to facilities outside their assigned geographic area on a case-by-case basis when these official services can not be provided in a timely manner by the official agency designated to serve that area. A timely manner is defined as follows:

Sampling/weighing services. 6 hours when a service request is received between 6 a.m. and noon, Monday through Friday, by the official agency designated to provide service; and 12 hours when a service request is received any other time by the official agency designated to provide service. This means 6 hours or 12 hours to have a sampler/weigher at the facility requesting service unless the customer requests a later arrival.

Inspection results. 12 hours from the completion of sampling of the units to be inspected. This means that the official agency providing the service shall provide inspection results to the customer not later than 12 hours upon completion of the sampling. This notification of results may be by telephone, telefax, or other electronic means, and does not apply to certification.

Facilities unable to obtain service within these time limits may request such service from another official agency. Customers using this pilot program must maintain sufficient documentation to establish that they could not receive timely service from the official agency designated to serve them (e.g., copy of faxed request for service). If GIPSA determines that a customer violates the provisions of this pilot program, such customer will no

longer be permitted to participate in the program.

Official agencies are encouraged to establish a means to accept customer orders during other than normal business hours. Official agencies must handle customer requests for service in the order received, where practicable. Official agencies asked to provide official services outside their assigned geographic area under the Timely Service pilot program must notify the Compliance Division, GIPSA.

The definition of timeliness in this pilot program supersedes the definition of "timely manner" currently stated in section 800.46(b)(5), and also, supersedes the time requirements stated in section 800.116(b) of the regulations under the Act for purposes of the pilot program only. These sections state that official personnel may not be available to provide requested services if the request is not received by 2 p.m., the preceding business day.

2. **Open Season.** This pilot program would allow official agencies an open season during which they may offer their services to facilities outside their assigned geographic area where no official sample-lot or official weighing services have been provided in the previous 6 months. Official agencies desiring to participate in this pilot program must submit their plans to provide official services to customers outside their assigned geographic area to Compliance Division, GIPSA, for review in consultation with the field office supervising the official agency. Upon approval by the Compliance Division, these official agencies would be permitted to participate in this program.

Official agencies participating in these pilot programs can provide, during the test period, any official services for which they are designated. Official agencies participating in pilot programs must arrange for any equipment (including laboratories and access to diverter-type mechanical samplers) that may be needed to provide official services at each site outside the area they are currently designated to serve.

These pilot programs will run for 1 year, starting November 1, 1995, and ending October 31, 1996. During this time, GIPSA will monitor these pilot programs. If, at any time, GIPSA determines that a pilot program is having a negative impact on the official system or is not working as intended, the pilot program may be modified or discontinued.

AUTHORITY: Pub. L. 94-582, 90 Stat. 2867, as amended (7 U.S.C. 71 *et seq.*)

Dated: September 19, 1995
 David R. Shipman
Deputy Administrator
 [FR Doc. 95-23908 Filed 9-26-95; 8:45 am]
 BILLING CODE 3410-EN-F

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of Export Administration

Materials Processing Equipment Technical Advisory Committee; Notice of Partially Closed Meeting

A meeting of the Materials Processing Equipment Technical Advisory Committee will be held October 25, 1995, 9:00 a.m., in the Herbert C. Hoover Building, Room 1617M(2), 14th & Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC. The Committee advises the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration with respect to technical questions that affect the level of export controls applicable to materials processing and related technology.

Agenda

General Session

1. Opening remarks by the Chairman.
2. Presentation of papers or comments by the public.
3. Discussion of status of Core List negotiations.
4. Election of Chairman.

Closed Session

5. Discussion of matters properly classified under Executive Order 12356, dealing with the U.S. export control program and strategic criteria related thereto.

The General Session of the meeting will be open to the public and a limited number of seats will be available. To the extent that time permits, members of the public may present oral statements to the Committee. Written statements may be submitted at any time before or after the meeting. However, to facilitate distribution of public presentation materials to the Committee members, the Committee suggests that presenters forward the public presentation materials two weeks prior to the meeting date to the following address: Lee Ann Carpenter, TAC Staff/BXA/ Room 1621, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th & Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

The Assistant Secretary for Administration, with the concurrence of the General Counsel, formally determined on February 5, 1992, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended, that the series of meetings of the

Committee and of any Subcommittees thereof, dealing with the classified materials listed in 5 U.S.C., 552b(c)(1) shall be exempt from the provisions relating to public meetings found in section 10(a)(1) and (a)(3), of the Federal Advisory Committee Act. The remaining series of meetings or portions thereof will be open to the public.

A copy of the Notice of Determination to close meetings or portions of meetings of the Committee is available for public inspection and copying in the Central Reference and Records Inspection Facility, Room 6020, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC 20230. For further information or copies of the minutes, contact Lee Ann Carpenter on (202) 482-2583.

Dated: September 21, 1995.
 Lee Ann Carpenter,
Director, Technical Advisory Committee Unit.
 [FR Doc. 95-23916 Filed 9-26-95; 8:45 am]
 BILLING CODE 3510-DT-M

International Trade Administration

Export Trade Certificate of Review

ACTION: Notice of Application for an Amendment to an Export Trade Certificate of Review.

SUMMARY: The Office of Export Trading Company Affairs (OETCA), International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce, has received an application to amend an Export Trade Certificate of Review. This notice summarizes the amendment and requests comments relevant to whether the Certificate should be amended.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: W. Dawn Busby, Director, Office of Export Trading Company Affairs, International Trade Administration, 202/482-5131. This is not a toll-free number.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Title III of the Export Trading Company Act of 1982 (15 U.S.C. §§ 4001-21) authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to issue Export Trade Certificates of Review. A Certificate of Review protects the holder and the members identified in the Certificate from state and federal government antitrust actions and from private, treble damage antitrust actions for the export conduct specified in the Certificate and carried out in compliance with its terms and conditions. Section 302(b)(1) of the Act and 15 CFR 325.6(a) require the Secretary to publish a notice in the Federal Register identifying the applicant and summarizing its proposed export conduct.

Request for Public Comments

Interested parties may submit written comments relevant to the determination whether the Certificate should be amended. An original and five (5) copies should be submitted no later than 20 days after the date of this notice to: Office of Export Trading Company Affairs, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce, Room 1800H, Washington, D.C. 20230. Information submitted by any person is exempt from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552). Comments should refer to this application as "Export Trade Certificate of Review, application number 87-10A004."

AMT—The Association For Manufacturing Technology's ("AMT") original Export Trade Certificate of Review was issued on May 19, 1987 (52 FR 19371, May 22, 1987) and was previously amended on December 11, 1987 (52 FR 48454, December 22, 1987), January 3, 1989 (54 FR 837, January 10, 1989), April 20, 1989 (54 FR 19427, May 5, 1989), May 31, 1989 (54 FR 24931, June 12, 1989), May 29, 1990 (55 FR 23576, June 11, 1990), June 7, 1991 (56 FR 28140, June 19, 1991), November 27, 1991 (56 FR 63932, December 6, 1991), July 20, 1992 (57 FR 33319, July 28, 1992), and May 10, 1994 (59 FR 25614, May 17, 1994).

Summary of the Application

Applicant: AMT—The Association For Manufacturing Technology, 7901 Westpark Drive, McLean, Virginia 22102-4269, Contact: Jerome D. Sorkin, legal counsel, Telephone: (202) 662-5569

Application #: 87-10A004

Date Deemed submitted: September 15, 1995.

Request for Amended Conduct

AMT seeks to amend its Certificate to:

1. Add each of the following companies as a new "Member" of the Certificate: Acro Automation Systems, Inc., Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Automatic Design Concepts, Bridgeport, Connecticut; Bentz, Incorporated, Detroit, Michigan; Capco, Inc., Roanoke, Virginia; Creative Automation, Inc., Plymouth, Michigan; Edgetek Machine Corporation, Meriden, Connecticut; ESAB L-TEC Cutting Systems, Florence, South Carolina; GEC Alsthom Cyril Bath Company, Monroe, North Carolina; Grav-i-Flo Corporation, Sturgis, Michigan; Hobart Brothers Company, Livermore, California; ISI Robotics, Fraser, Michigan; Jasco Tools, Inc., Rochester, New York; Keller Industries, Hollandale, Minnesota; K.T. Design &